

IN THE CLAIMS

5. A polycarbonate-based nonflammable resin composition as defined in Claim 1, characterized in that the alkoxy group-containing organopolysiloxane (C) includes a branched structure.
6. A polycarbonate-based nonflammable resin composition as defined in Claim 1, characterized in that the alkoxy group-containing organopolysiloxane (C) contains substantially no silanol groups (SiOH).
7. A polycarbonate-based nonflammable resin composition as defined in Claim 1, characterized in that R¹ of the alkoxy group-containing organopolysiloxane (C) is a methyl group, ethyl group, or phenyl group, and the phenyl group content is at least 20%.
8. A polycarbonate-based nonflammable resin composition as defined in Claim 1, characterized in that R² of the alkoxy group-containing organopolysiloxane (C) is a methyl group or ethyl group.
11. A polycarbonate-based nonflammable resin composition as defined in Claim 1, characterized by further containing (D) an anti-drip agent in an amount of 0.01 to 10 weight parts per 100 weight parts of the polycarbonate-based resin (A-1) or per combined 100 weight parts of the polycarbonate-based resin (A-1) and the thermoplastic resin (A-2).

A3
13. A polycarbonate-based nonflammable resin composition as defined in Claim 1, characterized by further containing (E) an alkali (alkaline earth) metal salt of a perfluoroalkanesulfonic acid in an amount of 0.01 to 3 weight parts per 100 weight parts of the polycarbonate-based resin (A-1) or per combined 100 weight parts of the polycarbonate-based resin (A-1) and the thermoplastic resin (A-2).

14. A polycarbonate-based nonflammable resin composition as defined in Claim 1, characterized by further containing (F) an epoxy-based stabilizer in an amount of 0.01 to 5 weight parts per 100 weight parts of the polycarbonate-based resin (A-1) or per combined 100 weight parts of the polycarbonate-based resin (A-1) and the thermoplastic resin (A-2).

A4
16. An electrical or electronic device part formed from a nonflammable resin composition as defined in Claim 1.

17. A molded article composed of a nonflammable resin composition as defined in Claim 1.

Objection of claims 5-8, 11, 13,14,16 and 17 under 37 CFR 1.75 (c)

Claims 5-8,11,13,14,16 and 17 stand rejected under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper multiple dependent form as a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. The claims have been amended to correct the multiple dependency. Examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

OK
02.21.2003

Rejection of claims 12 and-15 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As stated above, the multiple dependency of the claims has been corrected. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 12 and 15 under 35 USC 112 is moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12 and 15 is respectfully requested.

OK
Feb. 21, 2003

Rejection of claims 1,2,4,9 and 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al ('312) in view of Fuhr et al ('974)

Claims 1,2,4,9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al ('312) in view of Fuhr et al ('974). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested in view of the following remarks.

As pointed out by the examiner, Yamamoto et al. fails to disclose the phosphoric ester component as set forth in claim 1. Fuhr is cited to show a flameproofed polycarbonate material comprising a phosphorous compound.

There is no disclose or suggestion in either reference that a phosphorous compound as disclosed in Fuhr could be incorporated into a flameproofed polycarbonate material comprising a polycarbonate based resin and an alkoxy group containing organopolysiloxane in the manner claimed by Applicants to produce a material having a dramatic increase in the nonflammability. Fuhr further fails to disclose the phosphorous ester as disclosed and claimed by Applicants.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1,2,4,9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al ('312) in view of Fuhr et al ('974) is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al in view of Fuhr et al as applied to claim 1, further in view of JP58076447 ('447)

Claim 3 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al in view of Fuhr et al as applied to claim 1, further in view of JP58076447. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the following remarks.

As stated above, the Applicants are of the position that examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in the citation of Yamamoto et al ('312) in view of Fuhr et al ('974). Further, there is no disclose or suggestion in any of the cited references that the phosphorous compound as disclosed in '447 could be incorporated into a material as defined by the Applicants to produce a resin having superior flameproofing properties. Accordingly, the citations of Yamamoto et al in view of Fuhr

et al as applied to claim 1, further in view of JP58076447 fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al in view of Fuhr et al as applied to claims 1 and 14, further in view of Nishihara et al ('760)

As stated above, the Applicants are of the position that examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in the citation of Yamamoto et al ('312) in view of Fuhr et al ('974). Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the epoxy compound of Nishihara 447 could be incorporated into a material as defined by the Applicants to produce a resin having superior flameproofing properties. Accordingly, the citations of Yamamoto et al in view of Fuhr et al as applied to claim 1, further fail to establish a case of *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In view of the remarks above, Applicants submit that the claims are allowable over the art cited. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.